

### **Remarks**

The Advisory Action dated April 16, 2007 indicated that the amendments proposed in the Amendment After Final filed by the Applicant on March 21, 2007 were not entered because they raised new issues that would require further consideration or search. In view of this, the Applicants are filing the present Request for Continued Examination so that the claim amendments proposed in the Amendment After Final can be entered in the present application and considered by the Patent Office.

Claims 1-3 and 5-25 were pending in the present application prior to the present Request for Continued Examination. Claims 6, 9, 21, and 24 have been canceled, and claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 14, and 18 have been amended herein. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, and 25 are therefore currently pending in the present application.

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Request for Continued Examination and consideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the Applicant's comments below.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 and 5-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,640,565 to Dickinson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,322 to Tripp. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the Dickinson and Tripp patents fail to teach or suggest “*protocols working in a uniform operative language*” and “*protocols of the interface ... capable of transforming a search inquiry placed in a first language into one or more other operative languages, and thus enabling the transmission of search inquiries between servers that operate in different languages,*” as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 18. In the presently claimed design, the network of systems comprises a plurality of servers, each of which has at least a database, a search engine, and at least one search interface, wherein at least two of the servers are equipped with at least one interface having protocols established to communicate with each other. The present application discloses that “*almost all of the countries have their specified sets of characters, for instance, the specified set of Chinese characters GB2312. These sets of*

*characters may have correspondence with the set of characters of Unicode. Therefore, the web card search engine uses Unicode characters as the encoding format to store the web card data, such that the search mode of the web card search engine of the present invention may be adopted easily for other languages, such as Japanese and Korean, etc.”* (page 11, Lines 15-21), and *“It is the protocols that should work in a uniform language, and have ability to process the search inquiry placed in one language with this specific uniform language and to pass it on to other web card servers that may operate in different languages”* (page 14, lines 12-15, emphasis added). Therefore, the protocol equipped with the search interface is capable of transforming a search inquiry placed in a language into other operative languages, and thus enabling the transmission of search inquiries between servers that operate in different languages, such as between Chinese and Japanese. Therefore, the applicant submits that the protocol is different from typical transmission control protocol, such as TCP/IP, and thus different from the protocols disclosed in the Dickinson and Tripp patents.

For the foregoing reasons, in the network of the present invention, even if the servers are located in different countries using different languages, the transmission of search inquiries is enabled due to the use of the protocol equipped with the search interface for language transformation. This feature is not taught or suggested by the Dickinson or Tripp patents, and it is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 12 and 18 are not obvious in view of these references.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 18, and therefore are believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons, in addition to containing further patentable features. Claims 6, 9, 21, and 24 have been canceled, making the rejection of these claims moot. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant believes that all pending claims, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, and 25, are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is thus respectfully requested. If, however, there remain any issues which can be addressed by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this Amendment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON

Date: May 21, 2007

By: /michael fedrick/  
Michael Fedrick  
Reg. No. 36,799

100 E. Corson Street, Third Floor  
Pasadena, California 91103-3842  
(626) 796-4000  
Customer No. 23676